UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

CHASSIDY F. LUCAS, et al.,	CASE NO. C11-5350BHS
Plaintiffs,	MINUTE ORDER
v.	
JOE CAMACHO, et al.,	
Defendants.	

NOW, on this 6th day of June, 2012, the Court directs the Clerk to enter the following Minute Order:

On March 19, 2012, Plaintiffs filed a "motion for permanent anti-harassment order and permanent injunction." Dkt. 111. As the Camacho Defendants state in their response to the motion, Plaintiffs appear to be asking for preliminary injunctive relief but it is not at all clear. The Court agreed with the Camacho Defendants that Plaintiffs' motion "is impossible to understand—let alone defend." Dkt. 122 at 2. Accordingly, the Court ordered that if Plaintiffs wished to seek relief from the Court, they were required to do so in documents that comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and clearly

MINUTE ORDER - 1

1 and succinctly state what relief they are seeking and the authority and evidence they rely

2 on in seeking such relief. Dkt. 151. Plaintiffs' subsequent motion for permanent

3 injunction (Dkt. 133) fails to comply with the Court's order. In addition, Plaintiffs'

4 motion for contempt with sanctions (Dkt. 123) fails to comply with the Court's order in

5 that Plaintiffs fail to clearly and succinctly state what relief they are seeking or submit the

6 authority or evidence they rely on in seeking such relief.

7   Therefore, the motion for permanent injunction (Dkt. 133) and motion for

8 contempt with sanctions (Dkt. 123) are **DENIED**.

9   Plaintiffs are warned that if they continue to file motions and other pleadings that

10 do not substantially comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, such pleadings

11 will not be considered by the Court.

12   The foregoing Minute Order was authorized by the Honorable BENJAMIN H.

13 SETTLE, United States District Judge.

14   /s/ Trish Graham
                                   Trish Graham
15   Judicial Assistant

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MINUTE ORDER - 2